

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Heinänen Oy
Annankatu 31-33 C
FIN-00100 Helsinki
Finland

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

13 -07- 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference
104379 PJ/HA

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/FI2004/000211

International filing date (day/month/year)

07.04.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

10.04.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

B64C 1/38, F15D 1/02, 1/12

Applicant

PULKKA, Esko

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE
Patent- och registreringsverket
Box 5055
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM
Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Lena Nilsson / JA A

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FI2004/000211

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/FI2004/000211

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1 - 11	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1 - 11	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1 - 11	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Cited documents:

D1: EP, A2, 354022
D2: US, A, 3578264
D3: US, A, 3776363
D4: US, A, 4284302
D5: US, A, 4564959
D6: US, A, 5200573
D7: US, A, 5289997
D8: US, A, 5836840
D9: US, A, 6131853
D10: US, A, 6276636
D11: US, A, 6729846

A method for reducing kinetic friction, where devices and appliances of different materials, sizes and shapes are provided with profiled surface patterns to reduce kinetic friction when being in contact with air, gas or liquid masses, according to claims 1-3 is known from D1-D11. Thus, the invention defined in claims 1-3 is not new and consequently lacks novelty and inventive step.

D1-D11 discloses some different applications of this principle to reduce kinetic friction. In claims 4-10 merely a number of different fields of application for reducing kinetic friction according to claims 1-3 are enumerated, without specifying any technical solutions. Accordingly, it is a well known art to use different materials, sizes and shapes provided with profiled surface patterns for the

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/FI2004/000211

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V

purpose of reducing kinetic friction when being in contact with air, gas or liquid masses and hence, obvious to a person skilled in the art. Since no unexpected technical effect has been achieved, the invention defined in claims 4-10 must be considered as an obvious application of known art. Therefore claims 4-10 lacks novelty and inventive step.

Since the function of a "burning lens" must be regarded as general knowledge, the subject-matter of claim 11 is not considered to go beyond what can be expected from a person skilled in the art. Therefore, claim 11 lacks inventive step.